

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1-28 were rejected in the current Final Office Action. Applicant has herein amended claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 17 and 28, and claims 2, 18 and 24 have been canceled, without prejudice. No new matter is believed added.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment.

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Pulsipher *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,055), hereafter “Pulsipher.”

Claims 1-11, 14 and 17-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pulsipher in view of Steele *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,175), hereafter “Steele.”

With regard to the 35 USC 102(b) rejection, Applicant submits that the cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention as currently amended. For instance, with respect to independent claim 12, Applicant submits that Pulsipher fails to disclose,

*inter alia*, “operating the plurality of collection tools to collect device identification and detail information from devices on the network... wherein each collection tool is configured to collect a specific subset of the device identification and detail information for a specific operating system, and wherein at least one collection tool being configured to collect a different subset of the device identification and detail information for a different operating system from another collection tool.” Rather, Pulsipher teaches a distributed internet monitoring system such as, *inter alia*, “a management station 100a communicates to at least one other station 100, such as a collection station 100b or a management station 100a... The discovery mechanism 302 associated with each station, 100a, 100b is assigned to monitor a predefined respective region of the network 118.” (Pulsipher, Col. 9, Lines 21-28). As such, Pulsipher discloses collection stations for collecting information from different areas of a network to put together a full map. This is not the same as a plurality of collection tools each configured to collect specific subsets of device information for a certain operating system, such that the plurality of collection tools can collect all of the different types of information available.

In contrast, the current invention teaches using a plurality of collection tools to capture different types of information for different operating systems. Support for the amendment as well as a better understanding of the process can be found in Applicant’s immediate application, *inter alia*,

“In particular, collection system 40 is comprised of various software collection tools 42. Collection tools 42 are well known in the art and generally comprise software programs that are designed to retrieve certain information from devices 30. Example of such collections tools are Ecora™ by Ecora Corp. and Asset360™ by Percuity, LLC. Preferably, each collection tool 42 retrieves a different type of information.” (Page 13, second paragraph).

Thus, Pulsipher does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant submits that each of the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejections, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as currently amended. For instance, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that as Pulsipher fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “a collection system for collecting device identification and detail information ... wherein each collection tool is configured to collect a specific subset of the device identification and detail information for a specific operating system, and wherein at least one collection tool being configured to collect a different subset of the device identification and detail information for a different operating system from another collection tool,” Steele’s “preset collection cycle” (Col.2, Line 67) fails to overcome Pulsipher’s shortcoming.

Thus, Pulsipher in view of Steele does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Applicant asserts that the arguments given above for claims 1 and 12 apply similarly to independent claims 7, 17 and 23. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant submits that each of the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicant will forego addressing each of these rejections

individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejections.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

---

Hunter E. Webb  
Reg. No.: 54,593  
(ND)

Date: April 15, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)